

REMARKS**Status of Claims**

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-19 are currently pending in this application. No claim amendments have been made.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 13-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,073,192 to Clapp et al. (hereafter Clapp) and U.S. Patent No. 5,999,207 to Rodriguez et al. (hereafter Rodriguez). Claims 5-6 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp and Rodriguez, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,824 to Kato et al (hereafter Kato). The Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn for the following reasons.

In the Office Action (page 7), the Examiner states that Clapp teaches control commands, i.e. instructions being generated by application software running in the external data processor (72, Fig. 5) during a second operations mode (column 7, lines 30-65), and a communication device providing stand-alone video capability when it is not connected to the external data processor (column 7, lines 17-29). Moreover, the Examiner states that the claim language does not presently mention that the system is automatically switched back and forth between different operation modes. Thus, Clapp as well as a combination of Clapp and Rodriguez, is enough to reject the broad claim limitations of the claims. We disagree.

In the response filed on July 1, 2003, claims 1, 7 and 13-19 were amended to specifically recite "mode selecting means for automatically selecting between a first operation mode and a second operation mode." This feature is not believed to be taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

Clapp is directed to a peripheral video conferencing system and adapted for communication with an analog or digital communication channel and a separate host computer. Although Clapp appears to teach or suggest the ability to accommodate both stand-alone video conferencing and video conferencing using a host computer, nowhere does Clapp suggest a method of automatically switching between conferencing modes.

Moreover, neither Rodriguez nor Kato appear to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Clapp to render obvious the claims of the present invention. Therefore, even if one of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Clapp, Rodriguez and Kato, the combination still would not include all the features as recited in claims 1, 7 and 13-19. Therefore, claims 1, 7 and 13-19 are now believed to be distinguishable over the prior art of record, viewed individually or in combination. Likewise, claims 2-6 and 8-12 are also believed to be distinguishable over the prior art of record based on their dependency from claims 1 and 7, respectively.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4681.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1232-4681.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: June 17, 2004

By: 

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053